REMARKS

Claims 24 through 46 are pending in the present case. Claims 1 through 23 are canceled, and Claims 24 through 46 are newly added. No new matter has been added as a result of these claim amendments. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections for the reasons stated below.

§103 Rejections of the Claims

The rejection states that Claims 1 through 18 and 20 through 22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application No. 2002/0168178 (hereinafter "Rodriguez") in view of US Patent No. 5,978,043 (hereinafter "Blonstein"). Applicant respectfully traverses in view of the following.

Newly added independent Claim 24 recites a method for simultaneously caching content data via multiple channels in an electronic device, the method comprising, in response to a user specifically selecting a first channel to watch, allocating the first channel to a tuner, accessing prioritization data specifying a prioritization of a list of favorite channels associated with the electronic device, automatically selecting a plurality of favorite channels from the list of favorite channels based on the prioritization data and a number of spare tuners, automatically assigning the plurality of favorite channels to the number of spare tuners and simultaneously caching in a memory

content data from the first channel and from the plurality of favorite channels, as

claimed.

The rejection states that Rodriguez discloses the limitations of accessing data

specifying a set of channels, caching data for selected channels simultaneously, and

selecting channels for which to cache data from the set of channels, as claimed. The

rejection further states that Blonstein teaches the limitations of prioritizing favorite

channels and accessing data specifying a prioritization of the set of channels, as

claimed.

Regarding Claim 24, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined references

do not teach or suggest the limitations of <u>automatically selecting</u> at least one favorite

channel from the list of favorite channels based on the prioritization data and a number

of spare tuners, as claimed. Instead, Rodriguez merely teaches that a favorite channel

list is employed as an input to the controlling rules for displaying and buffering media

content. Thus, Rodriguez fails to teach or suggest <u>the automatic selection of favorite</u>

<u>channels according to the number of spare tuners</u>, as claimed. In contrast, Rodriguez

teaches the favorite channel list being used as input to the controlling rules which

control a change in displaying and/or buffering <u>when a new request for such an action is</u>

<u>received</u>, See Paragraph 136 – 137. So, Rodriquez fails to teach or suggest the

automatic nature of the favorite channel selection as claimed. Additionally, the

combined references do not teach or suggest the use of all the available tuners based

on the user specified favorite channel list, as claimed. Accordingly, the combined

references do not teach or suggest the limitations of automatically selecting at least one

favorite channel from the list of favorite channels based on the prioritization data and a

number of spare tuners, as recited in Claim 24.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combined references do not

teach the limitations of <u>automatically assigning</u> the plurality of favorite channels to the

number of spare tuners, as recited in Claim 24. Although Rodriquez teaches using

multiple tuners to receive from multiple channels, it fails to teach or suggest that any

spare tuner is automatically assigned to a favorite channel, as claimed. Rodriquez

merely teaches of <u>performing a resource query to determine if the resources exist to</u>

<u>tune</u> and buffer both display channels, See Paragraph 98. Even assuming Rodriquez

taught employing of a favorite channel list to control the display and buffering of media

content, it nevertheless does not teach the claimed limitations of <u>automatically assigning</u>

the plurality of favorite channels to the number of spare tuners, as claimed.

Accordingly, the combined references do not teach or suggest the limitations of

automatically assigning the plurality of favorite channels to the number of spare tuners,

as recited in Claim 24.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combined references do not

teach the limitations of simultaneously caching in a memory content data from the first

channel and from the plurality of favorite channels, as claimed. Particularly, Paragraph

99 of Rodriguez does not teach or suggest the limitations of caching the content data from the first channel and from the plurality of favorite channels. Rodriguez instead teaches if a first display channel is replaced by a second display channel and if there is another tuner available for the second display channel, the data for the first display channel is still being cached using the same tuner. Since the combined references do not teach or suggest every element recited in Claim 24, the Claim is not rendered obvious over Rodriguez in view of Blonstein.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 25 through 33 overcome the rejections of record by virtue of their dependency, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combined references fail to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of receiving a command signal for switching from the first channel to one of the list of favorite channels which is not currently assigned to a tuner, and de-allocating from the memory the content data from the first channel if the first channel is not in the list of favorite channels, as recited in Claim 30. Applicant respectfully submits that paragraph 110 of Rodriguez, which is the basis of the rejection, teaches of switching from one display channel to another display channel and allocating a respective resource for the operation. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion by the combined references of de-allocating the cached content data associated with the first channel being switched off if the first channel happens to be not a member of the favorite channels, as claimed. For this additional reason, Applicant

respectfully asserts that Claim 30 overcomes the rejections of record, and respectfully

solicits allowance of this Claim.

Regarding Claim 31, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combined references

fail to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of receiving a command signal for

switching from the first channel to another channel, wherein the first channel is in the list

of favorite channels, and maintaining the content data from the first channel in the

memory, as claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that paragraph 99 of Rodriguez,

which is the basis of the rejection, appears to teach maintaining caching of a first

display channel when the first display channel is switched to a second display channel

and there is an available resource (e.g., tuner) for the second display channel. Thus,

there is no teaching or suggestion by the combined reference of maintaining the content

data from the first channel if the first channel is in the list of favorite channels, as

claimed. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 31

overcomes the rejections of record, and respectfully solicits allowance of this Claim.

Regarding Claim 32, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combined references

fail to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of in response to a first tuner becoming a

spare tuner, selecting a second channel with a highest priority from the list of favorite

channels that are not currently being cached, and allocating the second channel to the

first tuner to cache content data for the second channel, as claimed. Applicant

respectfully submits that paragraph 121 of Rodriguez, which is the basis of the rejection,

teaches of managing resource in favor of a newly requested display channel. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion by the combined reference of selecting the highest priority channel from the list of available favorite channels for buffering if a spare tuner becomes available, as claimed. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 32 overcomes the rejections of record, and respectfully solicits allowance of this Claim.

Regarding Claim 33, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combined references fail to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of receiving a request to cache content data for a second channel whose content data is not being cached, selecting a third channel with a lowest priority from the list of favorite channels that are currently being cached, de-allocating the third channel from its assigned tuner and allocating the assigned tuner to the second channel, and caching content data from the second channel, as claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that paragraph 145 of Rodriguez, which is the basis of the rejection, teaches of determining as to which tuner to resource for a newly requested channel by comparing buffering durations of active channels and assigning the tuner for a newly requested channel. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion by the combined reference of the claimed features. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 33 overcomes the rejections of record, and respectfully solicits allowance of this Claim.

Independent Claims 34 and 39 recite limitations similar to that of independent Claim 24 and is therefore patentable over the cited reference for the same reasons. As such, allowance of the Claims is earnestly solicited. Additionally, allowance of Claims 35 through 38 and 40 through 46 that depend on the independent Claims is earnestly solicited.

The rejection also states that Claims 19 (which corresponds to newly added Claim 43) and 23 (which corresponds to newly added Claim 45) are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez in view of Blonstein and further in view of US Patent Application 2003/0030755 (hereinafter "Ahn"). Claims 43 and 45 depend on independent Claim 39. Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 43 and 45 overcome the rejections of record for at least the rationale previously presented with respect to Claim 39, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims. In particular, Ahn does not solve the deficiencies of Rodriguez in view of Blonstein as discussed above with respect to Claim 39.

Accordingly, allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application. Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

Murabito, Hao & Barnes LLP

Date   09-02-2008   By   /Steve S. Ko/
                                 Steve S. Ko
                                 Reg. No. 58,757

                                 Two North Market Street
                                 Third Floor
                                 San Jose, CA 95113
                                 (408) 938-9060